

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Emma Kaisla	Team: Squad #15	CCRB Case #: 202007141	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Saturday, 10/24/2020 10:00 AM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 107	18 Mo. SOL 4/24/2022	EO SOL 5/4/2022	
Date/Time CV Reported Tue, 10/27/2020 3:27 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: In-person	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 10/27/2020 1:00 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Witness(es)	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Brian Dietzel	11091	934770	107 PCT
2. POM William Wang	16405	959359	107 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. SGT John Czarnecky	01295	955851	PBQ/S

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Brian Dietzel	Abuse: Police Officer Brian Dietzel stopped § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
B.POM William Wang	Abuse: Police Officer William Wang entered § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
C.POM William Wang	Abuse: Police Officer William Wang searched § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
D.POM William Wang	Abuse: Police Officer William Wang failed to obtain language interpretation services for § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
E.POM Brian Dietzel	Abuse: Police Officer Brian Dietzel failed to obtain language interpretation services for § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Case Summary

On October 27, 2020, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB during a walk-in interview. § 87(2)(b) is a Mandarin speaker; his interview was conducted in Mandarin and interpreted to and from English by Inv. Justin Huang.

On March 24, 2020 § 87(2)(b) was at home § 87(2)(b) in Queens when he buzzed open his apartment building's front door, believing he was letting in his mother. He left his front door slightly ajar and walked into the stairwell to meet her, where he encountered PO Brian Dietzel and PO William Wang. § 87(2)(b) who had limited English proficiency, attempted unsuccessfully to communicate with the officers in English. PO Dietzel handcuffed § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). PO Wang entered § 87(2)(b) apartment through the open door and looked around (**Allegation B: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). **Allegation C: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**. PO Dietzel and PO Wang did not obtain language services for § 87(2)(b) until the end of the encounter, at which point PO Dietzel removed the handcuffs (**Allegations D-E: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**).

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Brian Dietzel stopped § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) provided a sworn statement on October 27, 2020 (Board Review 01). There were no additional civilian witnesses; the investigation was unable to contact the neighbor who interpreted for § 87(2)(b) and the officers.

It is undisputed that PO Dietzel and PO Wang responded to § 87(2)(b) entered the apartment building, walked upstairs, and met § 87(2)(b) in the § 87(2)(b) floor hallway. § 87(2)(b) had left his apartment door slightly open. After a brief attempt at communicating, PO Dietzel placed § 87(2)(b) hands behind his back and handcuffed him. He remained handcuffed until a neighbor came outside and interpreted between Mandarin and English for the officers and § 87(2)(b) at which point PO Dietzel uncuffed him. The specifics of the officers' interaction with § 87(2)(b) before he was placed in handcuffs, whether the neighbor exited his apartment on his own or if officers knocked on his door, and whether PO Dietzel's stop of § 87(2)(b) was proper remain in dispute.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that when he encountered the officers in the hallway, he tried to ask what was going on. The officers said they were responding to a 911 call. § 87(2)(b) responded in English "I no call 911." The officers told him they did not understand him. Both officers approached § 87(2)(b). PO Dietzel lightly grasped § 87(2)(b) on the arm and ushered him to the side of the § 87(2)(b) floor landing. PO Wang looked through § 87(2)(b) open door. § 87(2)(b) repeatedly tried to say in English "Why do you want to go in the house? This is my house." PO Wang did a calming motion by moving both hands with palms open toward § 87(2)(b) and then PO Dietzel took § 87(2)(b) hands and held them behind his back. PO Dietzel obtained a pair of handcuffs from PO Wang and handcuffed § 87(2)(b). After PO Wang entered § 87(2)(b) apartment (discussed in the following section), officers knocked on his neighbor's

door, at which point his neighbor came out and interpreted.

PO Dietzel and PO Wang's statements were generally consistent with each other. PO Dietzel and his partner PO Wang received a job of a 10-10 call for help—a possible crime—at § 87(2)(b). They learned it was an anonymous female § 87(2)(b) party caller and that the apartment unit number had a domestic violence history. Neither officer was familiar with the location from prior calls.

Officers heard no sounds or calls for help as they approached the § 87(2)(b) floor. When the officers encountered § 87(2)(b) there were no sounds coming from inside § 87(2)(b) apartment or from the neighboring apartments. Though § 87(2)(b) door was slightly open, neither officer observed anything through the open door that led them to believe something was amiss inside. The officers asked if § 87(2)(b) lived there, if anyone else lived there, and if there was a female inside. Both officers testified that to their questions, § 87(2)(b) did not respond or only responded by saying “yes” or “no.” Neither officer detected an accent in § 87(2)(b) speech.

PO Dietzel testified that the 911 caller reported a man calling out for help inside the apartment. When officers arrived on scene, someone called the callback number, but he did not recall if he or the dispatcher did so. When PO Dietzel reached the § 87(2)(b) floor, § 87(2)(b) was pacing in the hallway. § 87(2)(b) seemed to PO Dietzel unable to provide any answers; when he did say anything, he said only “yes” or “no.” PO Dietzel thought § 87(2)(b) was an emotionally disturbed person (EDP) because he was pacing and saying only “yes” or “no.” When asked about any other specific behaviors that indicated § 87(2)(b) was an EDP, PO Dietzel only stated § 87(2)(b) was not responding in a “normal” way. PO Dietzel believed § 87(2)(b) was acting “irrationally” because he was pacing back and forth; he was not doing anything else that PO Dietzel considered irrational.

PO Dietzel talked to § 87(2)(b) for a couple minutes. During this conversation, the officers had moved between § 87(2)(b) and his open apartment door. § 87(2)(b) did not make any hand gestures or attempt to approach the officers, until after a few minutes he tried to push past the officers to go back into his apartment. PO Dietzel put his arm up and stopped him, then turned § 87(2)(b) around and put him in handcuffs. PO Dietzel made the choice to handcuff § 87(2)(b) on his own; he did not discuss it with PO Wang. § 87(2)(b) did not resist in any way.

PO Dietzel put § 87(2)(b) in handcuffs because he believed § 87(2)(b) was irrational and an EDP, and because he did not know what was going on, why § 87(2)(b) was trying to push past the officers to get into the apartment, or if someone was injured inside. He also put him in handcuffs because he did not know if there were any weapons involved and did not want § 87(2)(b) to go inside and get a weapon. There was nothing specific that PO Dietzel observed or that § 87(2)(b) did that made PO Dietzel believe § 87(2)(b) would go and get a weapon, besides that he believed § 87(2)(b) to be an EDP. PO Dietzel also testified that he handcuffed § 87(2)(b) because there were only two officers present, and it would take too long for back up to arrive. He did not want PO Wang to go inside and for himself to be left with § 87(2)(b) alone in the hallway. At that point there was nothing that § 87(2)(b) was doing that he could have been arrested or summonsed for. After § 87(2)(b) was in handcuffs, his neighbor came out from a neighboring apartment on his own.

PO Wang testified that the 911 call contained no mention of a male individual. When the officers arrived on scene, the 911 dispatcher called the callback number and advised the officers to buzz to enter the apartment building. On reaching the § 87(2)(b) floor, PO Wang found the hallway very narrow. When the officers first came up the stairs, PO Wang did not recall how far away § 87(2)(b) was from the officers. § 87(2)(b) did not have anything on his person or anything in his hands. PO Wang never had any suspicion that § 87(2)(b) had a weapon on his person. After asking § 87(2)(b) some questions,

§ 87(2)(b) then became “aggressive” by approaching the officers in the narrow hallway. PO Wang felt this was aggressive because it put the officers in a dangerous situation due to the narrowness of the hallway and the proximity to the stairs. When § 87(2)(b) approached, he got decently close to the officers. Besides that he approached the officers and that he seemed upset, nothing else made § 87(2)(b) seem aggressive. PO Wang could tell § 87(2)(b) was upset because of his facial expression and because he was unresponsive to questions. PO Wang described § 87(2)(b) body language as “upset” and “aggressive;” but when asked to elaborate on this body language PO Wang only repeated that § 87(2)(b) approached the officers in a narrow space. PO Wang found § 87(2)(b) “irrational” because when asked simple questions his facial expression was upset and he did not answer the questions. That he was not answering questions and that he was upset was the full extent of the irrational behavior.

Prior to PO Dietzel putting § 87(2)(b) in handcuffs, PO Wang did not recall giving § 87(2)(b) any instructions. He did not recall PO Dietzel giving § 87(2)(b) any instructions. PO Wang believed § 87(2)(b) was an EDP because of the above-described behavior, because he did not want to answer simple questions, and because he gave very short answers. PO Wang did not suspect § 87(2)(b) of any criminal activity. After PO Wang checked § 87(2)(b) apartment (discussed in the following section) PO Wang and PO Dietzel knocked on the neighbor’s door to determine if the neighbors knew anything about the situation, prompting the neighbor to come out into the hallway. PO Wang realized there was a language barrier and § 87(2)(b) was not an EDP only when the neighbor came out and interpreted for § 87(2)(b) and the officers.

Based on § 87(2)(b) and PO Wang's consistent testimony, the investigation determined that officers elicited the neighbor’s participation in the incident by knocking at his door, and he did not exit his apartment spontaneously.

PO Dietzel and PO Wang were generally consistent as to § 87(2)(b) behavior, with some minor discrepancies. Only PO Dietzel described § 87(2)(b) as pacing in the hallway, and PO Dietzel described § 87(2)(b) approaching and pushing past the officers to enter his apartment, whereas PO Wang described § 87(2)(b) approach as happening in close proximity to the stairs. None of these details are corroborated or refuted by § 87(2)(b) account. Absent additional evidence, the investigation was unable to determine whether § 87(2)(b) was pacing, or where or if he approached officers.

While a review of the 911 call audios reveals the female caller does seem to mention a man, this was not recorded in the written Events Chronology (Board Review 08) and the dispatcher did not convey that information over the radio (Board Review 07, 09-12). The dispatcher only provided the following information over the radio: the call was a 10-10 call for help where a female gave the location § 87(2)(b) no conditions, and stated she needed police. The dispatcher also advised that the location was sensitive for EDPs and domestic violence. After officers arrived, the dispatcher called the callback number twice, and then instructed the officers over the radio to ring the bell to enter the building. After calling the callback, the dispatcher did not provide any additional information to officers about the condition or contents of the call. Given there is no information in the written Events Chronology nor in the radio recordings about a male and that PO Wang specifically stated the call contained no information about a male, the investigation determined that PO Dietzel’s statement that the call involved a male calling for help within the apartment was a misremembered detail. Based on review of the 911 radio audio and PO Wang's testimony, the investigation also determined that it was the dispatcher and not the officers who tried the callback number and spoke to the female caller.

People v. DeBour, 1976 40 N.Y. 2d 210 (1976), found that in order to stop a person, a police officer must have reasonable suspicion that the person has committed, is committing, or is about to commit

a crime. DeBour also evaluated whether information provided through an anonymous call was sufficient to establish the required reasonable suspicion by examining the quality and content of the information provided (Board Review 06).

§ 87(2)(g)
Lacking in content, the quality of the information was also in question, as the dispatcher characterized the caller in the Events as “rambling” “unclear” and “very uncorp,” noting she “has bad connection and is hard to hear.” Furthermore, neither officer ever spoke to the caller himself. § 87(2)(g)
as they proceeded with their investigation, they did not observe anything about the location to heighten their suspicion—the officers did not hear anything on their way up, and once upstairs did not hear any calls for help nor see anything inside the apartment through the open door that seemed amiss.

As for § 87(2)(b) behavior, PO Dietzel himself testified that there was nothing that § 87(2)(b) was doing that he could have been arrested or summonsed for. Neither officer testified to suspecting § 87(2)(b) of any specific crime at the time he was handcuffed. Rather, PO Dietzel’s justifications for putting § 87(2)(b) in handcuffs were based in uncertainty—that he did not know what was going on, why § 87(2)(b) was trying to push into his apartment, if anyone was injured, or if § 87(2)(b) was going to get a weapon. Yet PO Dietzel was unable to articulate any specific reason he believed someone was injured or that § 87(2)(b) was likely to go inside to obtain a weapon. § 87(2)(g)

NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 221-13 defines an EDP as a person who appears to be mentally ill or temporarily deranged and is conducting himself in a manner which a police officer reasonably believes is likely to result in serious injury to himself or others. An EDP may be taken into protective custody if they are conducting themselves in a manner likely to result in serious injury to themselves or others (Board Review 02).

PO Dietzel’s sole reasoning for believing § 87(2)(b) was an EDP was that § 87(2)(b) was pacing and saying only “yes” or “no” in response to questions. The investigation was unable to determine whether § 87(2)(b) was pacing in the hallway. § 87(2)(g)

Neither PO Dietzel nor PO Wang articulated any reason they reasonably believed § 87(2)(b) was likely to cause serious injury to himself or others. § 87(2)(b) was not holding anything in his hands and neither officer suspected him of having a weapon on his person. Per PO Dietzel, he was not making any hand gestures. § 87(2)(g)

PO Wang may have felt § 87(2)(b) approaching him with an upset expression on his face was “aggressive.” § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g) While PO Dietzel feared § 87(2)(b) would go inside and obtain a weapon, his only justification for believing § 87(2)(b) might do so was that he already believed § 87(2)(b) to be emotionally disturbed; a circular logic that cannot justify his initial classification of § 87(2)(b) as an EDP.

The officers' reported belief that § 87(2)(b) was an EDP is even more unconvincing given that officers elected to knock on a neighbor's door for assistance rather than calling an ambulance or for additional police back up. It is unclear what assistance in handling an EDP officers expected to receive from a civilian member of the public. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer William Wang entered § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer William Wang searched § 87(2)(b)

It is undisputed that once PO Dietzel put § 87(2)(b) in handcuffs, PO Wang entered § 87(2)(b) apartment through the slightly open door, entered every room in the apartment, and checked every space where a person could be by opening closet doors. He was inside the apartment for about a minute before rejoining PO Dietzel and § 87(2)(b) in the hallway. § 87(2)(b) did not verbally consent to PO Wang's entry into the apartment. Officers did not obtain a search warrant to enter § 87(2)(b) apartment.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that while in handcuffs, he told officers "this is my apartment" and "you can't go inside."

PO Dietzel and PO Wang both testified that as PO Wang was going inside the apartment, § 87(2)(b) did not say anything. PO Wang asked § 87(2)(b) if he could enter the apartment, and § 87(2)(b) did not respond. He had no other conversation with § 87(2)(b) about going into the apartment, and § 87(2)(b) never explicitly told him not to go inside.

Given the conflicting statements by § 87(2)(b) and the officers and absent additional evidence, the investigation was unable to determine whether § 87(2)(b) explicitly told PO Wang he did not consent to the entry. Still, this detail is ultimately irrelevant as it is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) did not explicitly give PO Wang consent, and neither officer testified that § 87(2)(b) handcuffed in the hallway, implicitly consented to the entry.

PO Wang testified that while in the hallway during the initial conversation with PO Dietzel and § 87(2)(b) he did not hear anything coming from inside § 87(2)(b) apartment. He did not hear anything from the other apartments on the floor. § 87(2)(b) apartment door was only slightly open, and he was not able to see anything inside. At the point when § 87(2)(b) was put in handcuffs, PO Wang did not suspect him of any criminal activity. PO Wang knocked on the apartment door and asked if anyone was inside. There was no response. While at the door knocking, he was still not able to see inside

the slightly open door into the apartment. He did not see anything through the open door that indicated to him that there was a problem or emergency. Still, PO Wang believed that there could be someone inside who was injured or who needed help; he expected this person would be the female caller. PO Wang testified he went inside the apartment in order to search for this person who needed help.

As noted above, the dispatcher only provided the officers the following information over the radio: that the call was a 10-10 call for help where a female caller gave the location § 87(2)(b) no conditions, and stated she needed police (Board Reviews 07, 12). The dispatcher also advised that the address was sensitive for EDPs and domestic violence. After officers arrived, the dispatcher called the callback number twice, and then instructed the officers over the radio to ring the bell to enter the building. The dispatcher did not provide any additional information to officers about the condition or contents of the call.

Absent consent from the occupant and absent a search warrant, the police may enter a private residence to address emergency situations. In order to do so, the situation must satisfy three requirements. First, the police must have reasonable grounds to believe that there is an emergency at hand and an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property. Second, the entry must not be primarily motivated by an intent to arrest or seize evidence. § 87(2)(b) there must be some reasonable basis, approximating probable cause, to associate the emergency with the area or place to be searched. People v. Doll, 21 N.Y.3d 665 (2013) (Board Review 16).

§ 87(2)(g) § 87(2)(g) As discussed above, the 911 call it contained no details of a crime or emergency nor a description of a suspect or victim. The dispatcher's advisory that § 87(2)(b) had an EDP and domestic violence history, § 87(2)(g) While the 911 call was for a call for help, PO Wang did not hear any calls for help or any other noises coming from § 87(2)(b) apartment or the neighboring ones. Through the slightly open door, he did not observe anything either while standing in the hallway or once he stood closer to the door to knock on it that led him to believe there was an emergency inside. PO Wang's statement that he did not suspect § 87(2)(b) of a crime and did not suspect that § 87(2)(b) had a weapon, undermines if not contradicts his own testimony that he believed there was an injured person inside the apartment. § 87(2)(g)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer William Wang failed to obtain language interpretation services for § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Brian Dietzel failed to obtain language interpretation services for § 87(2)(b)

It is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) could not effectively communicate in English. He did not specifically ask officers for language interpretation services or inform officers that he spoke Mandarin. Officers removed § 87(2)(b) handcuffs when a neighbor exited his apartment and translated between Mandarin and English for the officers and § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) described his English skills as "not very good." He stated he made a few statements to

officers in English, including “I no call 911” and “Why do you want to go in the house? This is my house.”

Both officers testified consistently that § 87(2)(b) responded to officers’ questions only by saying “yes” or no.” Neither officer detected an accent in § 87(2)(b) speech. PO Dietzel spoke no language besides English, and PO Wang spoke Shanghainese and had less than conversational Mandarin skills with limited aural comprehension. PO Dietzel testified that § 87(2)(b) seemed to him “unable to provide any answers,” but attributed this to his belief that § 87(2)(b) was an EDP and not to a language barrier. In PO Dietzel’s experience, people will often tell an officer proactively that they do not speak English. Besides pacing in the hallway and saying “yes” or “no,” nothing else made § 87(2)(b) seem like an EDP to PO Dietzel.

PO Wang testified that he realized there was a language barrier and § 87(2)(b) was not an EDP only when the neighbor came out and interpreted for officers.

§ 87(2)(g)

Patrol Guide Procedure 212-90 states that accurate interpretation/translation of foreign languages is important to providing police services and defines Limited English Proficiency (LEP) persons as those individuals whose primary language is not English and who are unable to effectively read, write, speak or understand English. It also states that when an officer encounters an LEP and their primary language is not apparent, they can do the following to ascertain their primary language: they can present any one of several multilingual graphics to the LEP to point out their language, contact the Language Line, or have the Operations Unit research the LEP’s country of origin (Board Review 05).

The NYPD’s Language Access Plan, developed to comply with Local Law 30 requiring city services be provided in the 10 most common citywide languages in addition to English, states that the department recognizes the importance of effective and accurate communication between its employees and the community they serve. When performing law enforcement functions, members provide free language assistance to LEP individuals whom they encounter *when necessary* [emphasis added] or whenever a LEP person requests language assistance services. The NYPD’s Language Access Plan also notes that the three most requested languages in the NYPD’s usage of the Language Line are Spanish, Mandarin Chinese, and Russian (Board Review 17).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b). The officers’ testimony that § 87(2)(b) was “unable to provide any answers” and responded only with “yes” or “no” are more reasonably indicators of an individual not speaking the language in which they are being addressed than of being mentally ill, temporarily deranged, or a threat to self or others. Being unable to speak English is not indicative of being an EDP. Furthermore, the officers’ decision to knock on a neighbor’s door for assistance is a much more appropriate response in a situation involving an LEP than an EDP; the officers’ behavior becomes incomprehensible if one credits their stated belief that § 87(2)(b) was an EDP.

Given the Patrol Guide’s outlined procedure for identifying an individual’s language when an individual has not communicated that information verbally, it follows that members of the public need not request language services in a language that officers speak in order to receive them. Such a requirement—that LEPs request interpretation services using a language they do not speak—would be nonsensical. § 87(2)(g)

The NYPD recognizes § 87(2)(b) first language, Mandarin Chinese, as one of the three most commonly requested languages in the city. These facts combined with the officers' descriptions of § 87(2)(b) behavior being reasonable indicators of an LEP individual, and their own responses being incompatible with a classification of § 87(2)(b) as an EDP, the investigation found their misidentification of an LEP as an EDP unreasonable and lacking common sense. That the officers took the above § 87(2)(g) actions of stopping § 87(2)(b) entering, and searching his home based in large part on their confusion about § 87(2)(b) verbal responses, and that the incident immediately resolved itself once an interpreter was found further indicates that not only were interpretative services necessary, but to reasonable officers the necessity should have been apparent § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party (Board Review 14)
- PO Brian Dietzel has been a member of service for 17 years and has been a subject in six prior CCRB complaints and 16 allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)
- PO William Wang has been a member of service for six years and has been a subject in one prior CCRB complaint with one allegation, which was withdrawn. § 87(2)(g)

Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) declined to mediate this complaint.
- As of August 18, 2021 the New York City Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed in regards this to complaint (Board Review 15).
- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Squad: _____ 15 _____

Investigator: Emma Kaisla Inv. Emma Kaisla 9/17/21
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Squad Leader: Simon Wang IM Simon Wang 10/07/21
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Reviewer: _____
Signature Print Title & Name Date

